

c. means associated with a first of said plurality of gaming apparatuses for printing a permanent storage record with a unique code representing an identification code;

d. a reader associated with a second of said plurality of gaming apparatuses, said reader being capable of reading said permanent storage record that was printed by said printing means associated with said first of said plurality of said gaming apparatuses; and

b1 e. means for providing a first signal to a host computer operatively coupled to said plurality of gaming apparatuses in response to reading of said permanent storage record to facilitate validation of said permanent storage record;

whereby said permanent storage record printed by said printing means associated with said first of said plurality of gaming apparatuses can be read by said reader associated with said second of said plurality of gaming apparatuses and credit can be authorized for play of said second of said plurality of gaming apparatuses.

Please add the following claim:

D2 85. A gaming system as defined in claim 77, wherein one of said gaming apparatuses comprises a slot machine and wherein said slot machine comprises a coinless slot machine.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, a new matter objection to the specification was made based on the addition of particular "means" recitations and the omission of the passage "cash out slip is augmented by a unique control number randomly generated by the CPU in a well known manner" from the "Summary of Invention" section of the application. A written description rejection of claims 77-81 was made based on the new matter objection, and an enablement rejection of claims 77-81 and 84 was made based on the inclusion in claim 77 of one of the "means" recitations identified in the new matter objection. Independent claim 77 was rejected under §102 as being anticipated by both U.S. Patent No. 5,179,517 to Sarbin, et al. and British Patent No. 1,558,521 to Chadwick, et al. Dependent claims 78-81 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chadwick, et al. in view of British Patent No. 1,391,060 to Patrick and U.S. Patent No. 4,626,672 to Sapitowicz. Dependent claim 84 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbin, et al. or Chadwick, et al. further in